

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 and 13-28 are pending in this Application.

By this Amendment, claims 1-10 and 13-28 have been canceled. New claims 29-55 have been added. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the newly added claims can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 29-55 are now pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 and 13-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,301,586 (hereinafter “Yang”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,608,930 (hereinafter “Agnihotri”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-10 and 13-28 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Yang and Agnihotri. Applicants respectfully submit that Yang and Agnihotri, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 29-55. These differences, along with other differences, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 29-55 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, claim 29 recites the limitation of “generating, with the one or more processors associated with the one or more computer systems, a consolidated printable representation of the multimedia information associated with the first multimedia document and the multimedia information associated with the second multimedia document based on at least one portion extracted from the first printable representation and at least one portion extracted from the second printable representation.” This limitation is supported in the Application, for example, at least in paragraph [17] where the Application teaches that according to another embodiment, printable representations for a first multimedia document and a second multimedia document are accessed to identify at least one portion of their printable representations that satisfies selection criterion. A consolidated printable representation is then generated that

includes the at least one portion of the printable representation for the first multimedia document and the at least one portion for the second multimedia document that satisfy the selection criterion.

Applicants respectfully submit that Yang and Agnihotri, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitation of “generating, with the one or more processors associated with the one or more computer systems, a consolidated printable representation of the multimedia information associated with the first multimedia document and the multimedia information associated with the second multimedia document based on at least one portion extracted from the first printable representation and at least one portion extracted from the second printable representation” as recited in claim 29. Specifically, while Yang provides the functionality to generate printable representations of multimedia information (such as exhibited in FIG. 23 of Yang), Yang and Agnihotri fail to disclose or suggest that it is from this data that portions are extracted to generate a combined printable representation as recited. For example, topics of interest to a user (which may be stored in a user profile) may be specified as selection criteria. The Application teaches in paragraph [213] that MIPSS 104 may generate a single printable representation that includes multimedia information from the plurality of news broadcast recordings related to the user-specified topics of interest. The single consolidated printable representation may then be printed to generate a single consolidated multimedia paper document that contains information related to “Middle East Terrorism” extracted from multiple multimedia documents. In this manner, multimedia information from various multimedia sources or documents related to user-specified topics of interest may be consolidated into a single printable representation that may then be printed to generate a multimedia paper document. The multimedia paper document generated in this manner is a valuable tool that enables the user to read and comprehend related information from multiple sources in a timely and efficient manner.

The Application teaches in paragraph [216], with respect to FIG. 14, that for each multimedia document identified in step 1402, MIPSS 104 searches the pages from the printable representation of the multimedia document to identify a set of pages that comprise information that satisfies the selection criteria determined in step 1402 (step 1406). MIPSS 104 then

generates a single consolidated printable representation that includes the pages determined in step 1406 (step 1408). The single printable representation generated in step 1408 may then be printed on a paper medium to generate a consolidated multimedia paper document (step 1410). The multimedia paper document generated in step 1410 comprises information selected from the plurality of multimedia documents based upon the selection criteria. For each page of the multimedia paper document generated in step 1410, information printed information that satisfies the selection criteria may be annotated. Yang and Agnihotri, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest anything similar such that a consolidated printable representation is generated that includes the at least one portion of the printable representation for the first multimedia document and the at least one portion for the second multimedia document that satisfy the selection criterion as recited in claim 29. In Yang, the pages in FIG. 23 are a final output merely to be printed with no further disclosure of their use. Agnihotri fails to cure the deficiencies of Yang to reach such a teaching.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Yang and Agnihotri fail to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in claim 29. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Yang and Agnihotri, and thus, claim 29 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 38 and 47 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 29, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 30-37, 39-46, and 48-55 that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 29, 38, and 47 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

For example, claim 33 recites consolidating at least one printable page extracted from the first printable representation and at least one printable page extracted from the second printable representation into the consolidated printable representation. Yang and Agnihotri fail to teach or suggest that pages that satisfy selection criteria are extracted from multiple printable representations to generate the consolidation as recited.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Further, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 20-1430.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
63217236 v1